

REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the thorough examination given the present application. Claims 1-5, 7-12 and 14 are currently being prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejections in view of the amendments and remarks as set forth below.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner is respectfully requested to acknowledge the Information Disclosure Statement filed on June 25, 2004. An initialed copy of the Form PTO-1449 should be sent to the undersigned at the earliest convenience of the Examiner.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 12 and 13 as being in improper multiple dependent form. With the present amendment, the dependency of claim 12 has been changed to depend only from claim 9. Claim 13 has been canceled. Thus, this objection is believed to be overcome.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-3, 6/3, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Silver et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,701,337). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner describes Silver et al. as having a wireless communication method for performing wireless communication between a calling side and a called side using a wide area wireless communication system capable of wireless calling, namely a paging network and a wireless communication system capable of data communication, namely a cellular network. Thus, Silver et al. discloses a combined mobile phone and pager where the pager activates the mobile phone in order to improve the mobile telephone power autonomy. An on/off switch on the mobile phone is activated by the pager through a relay. Thus, the battery on the mobile phone is used less, extending its life.

The present invention relates to a system which inherently has no calling function by relying on a system that does have a calling function. The system includes a network connected to the party, a radio LAN base station, a pager base station and a pager control apparatus connected to the network and a PC of a radio communication terminal with the PC having a radio LAN card and a pager card. The present invention succeeds in implementing data communication and speech conversation in a wireless LAN system where calling is not possible by using an existing pager system infrastructure.

Thus, the present invention differs from the Silver et al. device by relying on a communication system which does not have a calling function such as a LAN system. Thus, independent claims 1, 3, 7 and 9 all now describe one of the systems as being a non-calling system. Thus, this differs from Silver et al. where both systems are calling systems. In particular, Silver et al. shows a combined mobile phone and pager where the mobile phone is activated through an on/off switch activated by the pager through a relay. In the present invention, a data system having no calling function is connected with a pager system. Accordingly, Applicants submit that present independent claims 1, 3, 7 and 9 are not anticipated by Silver et al.

Claims 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Fujimori et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,327,475). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Fujimori et al. device relates to a selective pager which is capable of group paging or sending a message through a group broadcast transmission and to a selective paging base station which temporarily stores in memory a plurality of telephone numbers and a message received by way of a telephone line which continually transmits the message to the plurality of selected pagers. However, this reference does not teach two wireless communication systems one of which provides for wireless calling with the other having no calling function. Since claim 7 has now been amended to describe the wireless communication terminal as being a non-calling terminal, Applicants submit that this claim is not anticipated by Fujimori et al.

Claims 2, 4, 5, 8 and 10-14 depend from allowable independent claims and as such are also considered to be allowable. In addition, these claims recite other features of the invention, some of which are not seen in the references. These includes the possibility of speech conversation, the use of a wireless LAN, the conversion of data to audio and the inclusion of a switching off step after disconnecting. In view of these additional features, Applicants submit that these claims are additionally allowable.

Remaining Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 4, 6/4 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Silver et al. in view of Tran (U.S. Patent No. 6,496,693). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In regard to claim 6, it is noted that this claim has been canceled rendering this part of the rejection moot.

The Examiner relies on Tran to show a method for transmitting data or audio messages through transforming a voice message into a text message and using speech recognition. Applicants note that even if this reference does perform this feature, it does not aid the Silver et al. reference in overcoming its deficiencies noted above. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 4 and 11 overcome this rejection based on their dependency from allowable independent claims.

Claims 5/3 and 5/4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Silver et al. in view of Blink et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,542,751). This rejection is respectfully traversed.


The Examiner relies on Blink et al. to show a paging unit that can be used in a local area network. Applicants submit that even if this reference does show this feature, it still does not aid the Silver et al. reference in overcoming its deficiencies noted above. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 5 remains allowable based upon its dependency from allowable independent claim 3.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly distinguish over the patents relied upon by the Examiner, either alone or in combination. In view of this, reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of all the claims is respectfully requested.

Dated: October 27, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Joe McKinney Muncy
Registration No.: 32,334
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant

ROBERT F. CONLEY
27195